CHAPTER 8. NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 Natural Resources Management Implementation Goals

- Develop and update this INRMP annually and report on progress.
- Acquire personnel necessary to implement this INRMP.
- Acquire equipment and supplies necessary to implement this INRMP.
- Obtain funding and prioritize projects necessary to implement this INRMP.

8.2 Conservation Program Implementation

8.2.1 Conservation Program Implementation Plan

The purpose for the USARAK Conservation Implementation Plan (1998) was to gain approval and provide programmatic guidance to USARAK conservation program managers on the future structure of the conservation program. The Sikes Act, as amended in 1998, stipulates that planning-level surveys, integrated natural resource management plans and implementation of these plans are required for all DOD lands. Implementation of these plans required a higher level of effort than had occurred prior to 1998 and was not possible because of low priority for funding. This plan outlined the steps and identified the resources necessary to comply with the Sikes Act by supplementing the USARAK conservation program. The four objectives of the Conservation Implementation Plan were as follows:

- Prepare streamlined INRMPs and ICRMPs to make them the basis for project management for Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area, Fort Richardson, and Fort Wainwright.
- Realign current staff and request additional staff to implement the INRMPs and ICRMPs.
- Develop program management mechanisms to implement the INRMPs and ICRMPs.
- Update the EPR to reflect realistic requirements outlined in the INRMPs and ICRMPs.
- Obtain Army Command support for implementation of the INRMPs and ICRMPs.

These four objectives also serve as the basis for natural resources management implementation at Fort Richardson.

8.2.2 Conservation Program Management

Description and Justification: Conservation program management includes all the tasks required to plan, organize, and implement, and operate the natural resources program on Fort Richardson. Program management funds provide for staff positions, travel between the installations (Forts Richardson, Wainwright and Greely/Donnelly Training Area) and the Major Command at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. Travel includes travel associated with job sites, conferences and meetings. Funds also provide for required supplies to perform mission. Conservation program management also includes all the tasks associated with completing, maintaining, and updating all MOUs, MOAs, and cooperative agreements.

Measures of Effectiveness:

- ➤ Prepare, update, and submit the Conservation EPR on time twice per year during 2002-2006.
- ➤ Obtain and execute 100% of conservation funding annually during 2002-2006.
- ➤ Contribute to ISR and EQR report on time annually during 2002-2006.
- ➤ Execute conservation implementation plan during 2002-2006.
- ➤ Recruit and train adequate staff to conduct natural resources during 2002-2006.
- ➤ Prepare, update, and execute cooperative agreements, MOUs, and MOAs to accomplish natural resources management during 2002-2006.

Management History: Natural resources program management has been part of the natural resources management process since its inception in the 1950s. Program management at Fort Richardson, however, was clearly defined in the Conservation Implementation Plan approved in 1998. As a result of implementation of that plan, the number of conservation staff has doubled since 1998.

Current Management: Current management actions for ongoing conservation program management will cease in 2002. If this INRMP is not approved and funded, no conservation program management will continue. Policies already in place for conservation program management will continue.

Proposed Management: Conduct conservation program management at Fort Richardson as outlined in Table 8-1.

Other Management Alternatives Considered and Eliminated: There are other potential methods for conducting conservation program management. No other options, however, would meet the needs of the military mission. Other actions would be too minimal or would be cost prohibitive.

8.3 Project Management Planning and Reporting

8.3.1 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan

Project Description and Justification: Prepare, update, and implement an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) for Fort Richardson. The centerpiece of natural resources planning is the INRMP. Updates of the INRMP are required by Public Law 106-65 (Military Land Withdrawal Act) as mitigation for the land withdrawal LEIS, and by Public Law 86-797 (Sikes Act) every five years. Per Memorandum DAIM-ED-N, 21 March 1997, this INRMP is a class 1 requirement.

Measures of Effectiveness:

- ➤ Complete, maintain, and update a current INRMP approved by the MACOM.
- ➤ Identify requirements for resourcing INRMP projects in the EPR.
- ➤ Involve the public in the review of INRMP updates.
- ➤ Involve USFWS, ADF&G, and BLM as cooperators in the INRMP.
- ➤ Ensure that INRMP components are clearly identified and compatible with the Installa-

Table 8-1. Conservation Program Management.

OBJECTIVE	RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION	PRIORITY	IMPLEMENTATION				
			2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Update EPR based on updated projects in this INRMP in 2002.	USARAK Natural Resources	High	x				
Conduct training for conservation personnel annually during 2002-2006.	USARAK Natural Resources	High	x	x	x	x	x
Execute all conservation funding based on the priorities listed in this plan during 2002-2006.	USARAK Natural Resources	High	x	x	x	x	x

tion's Master Plan, Range Development Plan, Endangered Species Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

Management History: The first INRMP for Fort Richardson, covering the 1998-2002 period, was completed in 1999.

Current Management: Integrated natural resource planning is accomplished through preparing and updating the INRMP at least every five years. Integrating the many components of natural resources can be a complex challenge. One of the objectives of ecosystem management in USARAK is to develop a process to objectively identify requirements for all wild species and human users of the land. In addition, natural and cultural resource projects can only be classified as benefiting the military (and therefore a valid expenditure of military funds) if there is a direct link back to the accomplishment of the overall military mission.

This INRMP is structured to demonstrate direct support of the overall military mission, which includes stewardship of natural and cultural resources, compliance with environmental and cultural resources laws, an enhanced quality of life, and military training support. Every single project and task in the INRMP is focused to add to the accomplishment of one or more of these natural resource goals.

Proposed Management: Prepare and update the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for Fort Richardson as outlined in Table 8-2.

Other Management Alternatives Considered and Eliminated: There are no alternatives to maintaining a current Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan with updates at least every five years. An up-to-date INRMP is required by the Sikes Act. NEPA documentation is also legally mandated.

8.3.2 Management Action Plans

Project management planning is accomplished through the INRMP, action plans, and work plans. Ten action plans and two annual work plans provide the project detail necessary to implement each post's INRMP. Each action plan contains five years worth of detailed projects. Each detailed project can be used as a guide for in-house staff to accomplish the work, or as a scope-of-work if the project is to be contracted out. Action plans that are components of this INRMP (see Appendix D) include the ecosystem management action plan, special interest areas management action plan, wetlands management action plan, forest management action plan, fire management action plan, habitat management action plan, soil resources management action plan, aerial monitoring action plan for ecosystem management, and the outdoor recreation management action plan.

8.3.3 Conservation and ITAM Work Plans

The USARAK conservation annual work plan was created to track funding, obligations, and execution for natural resource projects and tasks. Each project contains the following information: project name, priority, EPR number and name, description, funding required, funding allocated, funding obligated, year funded, agency (in-house or contractor), NEPA required, Section 106 required, permit required, primary USARAK point of contact, project status, and comments. The conservation annual

Table 8-2. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.

OBJECTIVE	RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION	PRIORITY	IMPLEMENTATION				
			2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Prepare annual updates of the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.	USARAK Natural Resources	High	x	x	x	x	x
Prepare and update the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for the planning period of 2007-2011.	USARAK Natural Resources	High					x
Complete NEPA documentation for update.	USARAK Natural Resources	High					x

work plan does not replace the EPR, rather it enhances the planning and execution of projects.

The ITAM work plan is an annual work plan that shows ITAM requirements for five years. This document is created by the ITAM Coordinator, submitted by the DPTSM, validated by USARPAC, and turned in to DA DCSOPS as the basis for ITAM funding. The purpose of the ITAM work plan is to:

- Define individual project and work activities.
- Designate, prioritize, and identify a cost to execute those projects.
- Track project execution during a fiscal year.
- Describe multi-year ITAM programs and requirements for installations, MACOM HQ, and supporting agencies.
- Report all ITAM resource requirements, based on the set of standard work categories.
- Capture program execution and adjustments over the course of a fiscal year.

The installation work plan is developed in the early spring of each year to reflect ITAM program requirements in detail for the following five fiscal years. The work plan reflects all ITAM activities for the installation. Once projects are identified, they are prioritized from the most to least important. Approval of these projects and priorities is obtained from the DPTSM prior to completing the work plan. Once the projects are approved, they are entered into the Installation Work Plan Analysis Module (IWAM) database.

Each project is described to convey the scope of work. Costs should include all labor, materials, and equipment necessary to execute the work. Once the DPTM/G3, or equivalent, approves the installation submission package, the entire package is submitted electronically to the MACOM ITAM program manager. The MACOM ITAM program manager, in conjunction with his environmental staff counterpart, will review and validate, by project, the installation work plans using the MACOM version of the WAM, or MWAM. Once validated, the work plan becomes a MACOM-recognized ITAM resource requirement.

8.3.4 Environmental Program Requirement (EPR)

The Environmental Program Requirements (EPR), an annual report submitted by USARAK, serves as both an environmental project status report and a project requirement submission detailing environmental projects required to obtain or remain in compliance with environmental laws. The conservation portion of the report covers all natural and cultural resources projects and program areas. The EPR is used as a planning tool for integrated natural resources management, and is the basis for funding conservation projects (except ITAM). EPR natural resource projects are based on projects presented in this INRMP.

8.3.5 Environmental Quality Report

The Environmental Quality Report is an annual report submitted by USARAK that meets a Congressional mandate for the Army to report on the environmental quality of their installations. USARAK must report on the status of meeting DOD Measures of Merit targets.

8.3.6 Installation Status Report

The Installation Status Report (ISR) is a senior decision-maker system designed to provide standardized reporting of installation capabilities and condition based on uniform Army-wide criteria. The system provides executive-level information on the condition of installations. ACSIM is the proponent for ISR, however, each agency should proactively work to ensure that its facilities and programs are accurately portrayed. The system includes three parts: Part I-Infrastructure, Part II-Environment, and Part III-Services. Together these three sections are designed to provide an overall picture of an installation's status, and show how deficiencies in installation condition affect the environment and mission performance.

ITAM is contained in Part I of the ISR (i.e., the evaluation of maneuver land). ISR, Part I, is an evaluation in both quantitative and qualitative

terms, of all major facility groups, including ranges and maneuver land. The ISR uses RPLANS and IFS data as the basis for quantitative measurements of facility shortfalls and/or excesses at the installation level, with MACOM and Army-wide roll-ups. User evaluations, based on standard criteria, determine the qualitative portion of the ISR. Because ranges and maneuver lands are included in this section of the ISR, the accuracy and effectiveness is of importance to the ITAM community. In fact, the establishment of an effective ITAM program is included as a qualitative factor for maneuver land.

Conservation is contained in Part II of the ISR. The conservation portion of the ISR focuses on progress of natural resource programs, funding applied to all components of the program, and compliance with various natural and cultural resource-related laws.

8.4 Staffing

There are nine natural resources staff personnel at Fort Richardson who specifically implement most provisions of this INRMP. Natural resources personnel at Fort Wainwright also provide support for implementation of this INRMP. Positions at Fort Richardson include the Fort Richardson Natural Resources Branch Chief, USARAK Deputy Natural Resources Chief, Fort Richardson ITAM/ Conservation Coordinator and lead scientist for USARAK, Fort Richardson LCTA Coordinator, USARAK Cultural Resources Specialist, two GIS Specialists, two Conservation Officers.

Employees stationed at Fort Wainwright who have responsibilities at Fort Richardson include the NEPA Coordinator, USARAK Forester, USARAK Recreation Specialist, and the USARAK Aviation Specialist. The Fire Management Coordinator is an employee of BLM, also stationed at Fort Wainwright.

Since the natural resources disciplines encompassed within this INRMP (AR 200-3) are the natural sciences, USARAK is mandated by AR 200-3 to establish the optimum staffing of natural resources management professionals, appropriate to the resources, to ensure necessary technical guidance in the planning and execution of the natural resources program. USARAK will establish positions as needed and fill validated positions in accordance with current DOD/DA policy.

The management and conservation of natural resources under Army stewardship is an inherently governmental function. Therefore, the provisions of AR 5-20 (commercial activities program) do not apply to the planning, implementation, enforcement, or management of Army natural resources management programs. However, support to the natural resources program, where it is severable from management, planning, implementation or enforcement actions of natural resources may be subject to the provisions of AR 520.

Personnel positions which have been validated as required for the planning, implementation, enforcement, and management of the natural resources program, will not be subject to provisions of AR 520. This includes all positions (for example, professional, technical, equipment operators, natural resources law enforcement professionals, laborers, and so on.) which have been validated as a requirement to perform natural resources management. Personnel positions associated with activities which support (on an as needed basis), the natural resources program (for example, equipment operators or laborers from a pool or another shop) may be subject to the provisions of AR 520.

The ideal situation would be for all positions to be full-time, permanent federal positions. Considering current Army personnel policies, the addition of permanent, full-time federal positions at Fort Richardson is not likely in the foreseeable future. A blended workforce appears to be a necessity. USARAK is also directed by AR 200-3 to seek technical assistance from appropriate natural resources agencies (federal, state, and local). USARAK will pursue options to fill staff positions in a manner that will accomplish the most efficient blended workforce as possible.

Implementation of this INRMP requires assistance from USARAK's partners and cooperators, both signatory and otherwise. Specific needs from organizations external to Fort Richardson are indicated throughout this document. It is impossible for USARAK to hire the specialized expertise needed for some projects within this INRMP. USARAK will require considerable expertise from universi-

Table 8-3. Positions Needed at Fort Richardson to Implement the INRMP.

NUMBER	POSITION TITLE	CLASSIFICATION
1	Natural Resources Chief	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Deputy Natural Resources Chief	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Wildlife Biologist	Natural Resources Specialist
1	ITAM/Conservation Coordinator	Natural Resources Specialist
1	LCTA Coordinator	Natural Resources Specialist
2	GIS Specialist	Natural Resources Specialist
1	USARAK Forester*	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Outdoor Recreation Coordinator*	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Aviation Coordinator*	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Cultural Resource Coordinator	Cultural Resources Specialist
1	NEPA Coordinator*	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Fire Management Coordinator*	Fire Management Specialist
2	Conservation Officers (Game Wardens)	Conservation Enforcement Specialists

*Positions located at Fort Wainwright

ties, agencies, and contractors to accomplish some tasks. USARAK will reimburse parties for much of this assistance.

In-house Capabilities: USARAK has limited in-house research or special project capabilities as a result of manpower restrictions and natural resources' management-oriented mission. Some studies and projects require specialized academic training while others require more trained staff than available at USARAK. USARAK personnel have access to extensive data on vegetation, wildlife populations, and range status. USARAK's GIS is a powerful in-house research asset. During the next five years, as GIS comes online with relatively complete databases, the GIS will be used to support projects described in this INRMP.

Other Agency Support: The Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1972 (IPA) is a means to accomplish research or obtain personnel assistance. IPA is a system where a federal (or state) agency "borrows" other federal or state agency personnel for a limited time to do a specific job. Any state or federal agency is authorized to participate. The installation pays the borrowed employee's salary and administrative overhead. Major advantages are that personnel are directly supervised, and manpower authorizations are not required.

University Assistance: Universities are a good source of research assistance. USARAK has used several universities in recent years to help with specialized needs. Use of universities for research will continue in 2002-2006. The primary source of university personnel assistance will be from Colorado State University to help implement the USARAK Conservation and ITAM program.

Another "borrowed personnel" option is through the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (ORISE). Oak Ridge Associated Universities manages and operates the ORISE research participation program for the U.S. Department of Energy. ORISE is a consortium of 88 doctoral-granting colleges and universities, providing students and post graduates opportunities to gain experience in their respective fields by working on Army installations. ORISE program coordinators at the Army Environmental Center are points of contact for the program. ORISE personnel are appointed research participants, gaining hands-on experience and assigned to complete multiple tasks for the duration of their employment. Stipends are equivalent to salaries for employees hired with similar educational backgrounds, with a 30% overhead added. ORISE personnel can be appointed for a maximum three-year term. Installations may assist in the selection

of ORISE personnel. ORISE is another option for securing manpower assistance during 2002-2006.

Contractor Support: USARAK may also turn to outside contractors for completion of studies and projects. Contractors give ERD access to a wide variety of expertise. Contractors may be used for projects such as plan preparation, NEPA documentation, aerial census and photography, LRAM implementation, and similar activities. In 2002-2006 they will be used as needed to implement this INRMP.

8.5 Program Management Mechanisms

USARAK has six formal mechanisms to obligate funding, enhance partnerships, enable management decisions, enhance communication, and increase efficient dissemination of information regarding the natural resources program. These mechanisms are explained in further detail in the following sections.

The six mechanisms include the following:

- Mechanisms to partner and obligate funds.
- The conservation newsletter.
- The conservation web site.
- In-progress review.
- Conservation and ITAM work plans.
- Conservation team.

8.5.1 Partnering and Obligation Mechanisms

USARAK uses five means to accomplish work to implement this plan in the following priority:

- Perform work in-house.
- Use cooperative agreements with other natural resource agencies.
- Use GSA environmental services contracts.
- Use job order contracts.
- Use open bid contracts.

8.5.1.1 In-House

The first priority for implementation of this plan will be to use the USARAK in-house work force. USARAK in house capabilities include permanent natural resource employees, other Public Works organizations (such as roads and grounds, carpentry shop, etc) and troop projects. These methods are usually the least expensive, but also tend to be the least flexible. All funds obligated toward in-house work must be expended in the current fiscal year. Due to the reduction of federal in-house positions, the amount of work that can be accomplished in-house dwindles every year.

8.5.1.2 Cooperative Agreements

The next priority for accomplishing work to implement this plan is through cooperative agreements. AR 200-3 directs that where applicable, an installation should enter into cooperative plans, in accordance with 16 USC 670a, with state and federal conservation agencies for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife, soil, outdoor recreation, and other resources. Furthermore, when entering into contracts for services that implement wildlife management objectives or enforce natural resources laws (that is, wildlife management and endangered species plans and surveys), priority will be given to contracts with federal, state, and local agencies with responsibility for natural resources conservation. In these cases competitive bids are not required.

8.5.1.2.1 Department of Defense Agreements

Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) between DOD and other resource agencies provide the authority for installations to develop their own cooperative agreements in attainment of mutual conservation objectives with these agencies.

MOUs have been established between the Department of Defense and the Departments of Agriculture (March 27, 1963) and Interior (April 7, 1978) which are applicable to CONUS installations.

- Department of Agriculture functioning through the Agriculture Research Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service for the use, development, protection, and con-

servation of forest and other vegetative cover resources, for soil and water conservation, and for research relating thereto.

- The Department of the Interior functioning through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) for the conservation of fish and wildlife resources.
- The Department of the Interior functioning through the National Park Service for the development and management of outdoor recreation activities.
- The Department of Agriculture functioning through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and Animal Damage Control (ADC) for animal damage control on military installations. A formal Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Defense and U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service was signed May 15, 1990. This MOU establishes procedures for planning, scheduling, and conducting animal damage control activities, exclusive of routine vertebrate pest control operations, on U.S. military installations within the United States and its territories.

Assistance may also be obtained from other government agencies not specifically included in the above Memorandums of Understanding (for example, Agricultural Extension Service, Bureau of Land Management, Environmental Protection Agency, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), universities, state, and local conservation agencies).

A Memorandum of Agreement between the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) (U.S. Forest Service) and the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) (December 1990) for the conduct of insect and disease suppression on lands administered by DOD. Section 5 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to protect trees and forests, wood products, stored wood and wood in use from insects and diseases. The U.S. Forest Service has been delegated the responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act. Annual appropriations, based on estimated suppression costs developed by the Forest Service, DOD, other federal agencies, States, and other cooperating entities, are necessary to implement this responsibility.

A master agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture (September 1988) establishes the standards for the use of national forest system lands for military activity.

A cooperative agreement between the Department of Defense (DOD) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) (December 13, 1988) declared a policy of cooperation and establishes procedures for planning and conducting cooperative efforts between TNC and DOD on DOD lands. Under this agreement, installation commanders can obtain technical assistance from TNC and State Heritage Programs, as well as allowing TNC to study significant ecosystems under the Army's control.

8.5.1.2.2 USARAK Cooperative Agreements

USARAK has developed the following cooperative agreements to implement this plan and the conservation program. These cooperative agreements are found in Appendices B and C.

- *Cooperative Agreement for Management of Natural and Cultural Resources on Army Lands in Alaska.* This agreement is part of this INRMP and details cooperative management between USFWS, BLM, and ADF&G.
- *Cooperative Agreement for Fire Suppression on Army Lands in Alaska.* The Army has an agreement with BLM-Alaska Fire Service (AFS) whereby AFS is provided facilities on Fort Wainwright in exchange for fire protection on all Army lands in Alaska.
- *Cooperative Agreement for Natural, Cultural, and Environmental Support.* This agreement with the Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands at Colorado State University provides support for natural and cultural resources, as well as environmental management.

- *Cooperative Agreement for Vegetation Management Support.* USARAK has entered into a cooperative agreement with ADNR, Plant Materials Center (PMC) to conduct revegetation projects and provide plant materials advice.
- *Cooperative Agreement for Erosion Control and Habitat Management.* USARAK has entered into a cooperative agreements with both the Delta Soil and Water Conservation District (DSWCD) and the Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District (PSWCD) for enhancing, rehabilitating, and maintaining USARAK training lands to ensure their continued long-term use and effectiveness. The districts partner with USARAK to conduct LRAM, erosion control, and habitat management projects.
- *Cooperative Agreement for the Conduct of Soil Surveys on Fort Richardson.* USARAK has entered into an agreement with the Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) for the purpose of conducting soil surveys on Fort Richardson.

8.5.1.3 Other Obligation Mechanisms

When in-house staff or cooperating agencies cannot perform work, USARAK looks to one of three contract mechanisms. The GSA environmental services schedule provides companies that have already gone through an open bid process to be on the GSA contract. Contracting to one of these companies is relatively simple and fast. The Job-Order Contract (JOC) in place in USARAK provides quick and efficient service. However, when none of these other options is available, USARAK can use the open bid process through Directorate of Contracting.

8.5.2 Conservation Web Page

The USARAK conservation web site is the official means for obtaining the most current natural and cultural resources information, such as publications available for public review (including this INRMP), published documents, hunting, fishing, and trapping information, firewood and Christmas tree cutting information, and USARAK conservation personnel telephone and e-mail addresses. All information on this site is unclassified and accessible to the public. Everything on the site may be distributed and reproduced. Maintenance includes adding new features and links to other web sites, and updating, adding, or deleting content. Anyone may request an update to the ITAM web site. To request an update to the web site, send an e-mail message to the conservation webmaster via the e-mail address provided on the site. The web site can be accessed at http://www.usarak.army.mil/conservation/.

8.5.3 Conservation Newsletter

The Conservation Newsletter is an official USARAK publication and is a means by which conservation personnel can share information about trends, events, and current thoughts related to the conservation program with the public. The newsletter will also be used to inform the public about upcoming conservation-related events, and will serve as a reminder that documents are available on the website. Installation success in the conservation program depends on involvement of the public. The submission deadlines for the Conservation Newsletter are included in each issue and are also posted on the conservation website. Unless articles appearing in the newsletter are copyrighted, they may be reproduced and shared.

8.5.4 In-Progress Review (IPR)

The USARAK Conservation/ITAM In-Progress Review (IPR) process is the forum by which conservation personnel report annual accomplishments and brief future plans and requirements to the USARAK Environmental Chief, USARAK Range Manager, and Range Officers from each post. The IPR provides an opportunity for discussion between the conservation personnel from each post and the USARAK range and environmental staff. MACOM conservation and ITAM personnel are invited to participate.

The Deputy Natural Resources Chief hosts the IPR on a semi-annual basis. The semi-annual IPRs are identified as IPR FY XX-1, held in October, and IPR FY XX-2, held in April. The Deputy Natural Resources Chief chairs the IPRs.

The purpose of IPR FY XX-1 is to conduct the following:

- Report on accomplishments from each post and functional area.
- Provide an after-action review of projects that includes lessons learned.
- Set current fiscal year project tasks and deadlines.
- Develop future fiscal year goals and objectives.
- Obtain approval for future endeavors.

Based on the IPR FY XX-1 discussions, the Deputy Natural Resources Chief formulates a plan of action for accomplishing current and future fiscal year projects.

The IPR FY XX-2 is held in April prior to the upcoming field season. The purpose of IPR FY XX-2 is for project managers to brief their plans for summer field projects. This allows project managers to ensure integration among the many field projects. This also allows NEPA and cultural resources coordinators to ensure that proper project documentation has been completed or is in progress.

8.5.5 Conservation Team

The USARAK conservation team exists to promote integration and enhance project execution. All natural and cultural resource employees of USARAK are members of the conservation team. The conservation team was created to allow free exchange of ideas and information amongst the members on all three posts. The conservation team also exists to tackle technical scientific issues necessary to carry out projects. There are three permanent components of the USARAK conservation team: the conservation team north of the range (Forts Wainwright and Greely), the conservation team south of the range (Fort Richardson), and the conservation steering committee. Ad hoc committees are created and convene as necessary. Ad hoc committees include the ecosystem management team and the LCTA/ATTACC team. Conservation personnel often serve on a number of these permanent and ad hoc teams.

The conservation teams, north and south of the range, meet monthly or bi-monthly. Each conservation team elects a team leader who is responsible for scheduling meetings, setting an agenda, and moderating meetings. The north and south of the range conservation teams conduct project coordination and track project execution based on the conservation work plan. Teams also develop new requirements for future projects. All members have the authority to raise or discuss issues in the team forum. The conservation steering committee meets as needed to prioritize program and project requirements as developed from the teams. The conservation steering committee is responsible for preparing and updating the conservation work plan.

8.6 Project Priorities and Funding

8.6.1 Project/Program Priorities

The Sikes Act and/or DA policy require preparation and implementation of this INRMP, and therefore, this is a high funding priority according to OMB Circular A-106 rules. This INRMP is a Federal Facilities Compliance Agreement with action required in a published NEPA document, which also qualifies it for high priority funding. There are programs within this INRMP that are required for compliance with other laws and executive orders, especially involving pollution prevention, restoration, wetlands, etc. The relative importance of projects and programs specifically included within this INRMP are presented in Table 8-4. Each category's programs are listed by priority in the order they are first mentioned in this document. USARAK will fund all high priority projects. USARAK will fund all medium and low priority projects as funding is available.

Table 8-4. Fort Richardson Project Priorities for 2002-2006.

Project	Priority	Reference	Area *
Ecosystem Management Plan	High	Section 3.2.1	All
Aerial Monitoring Plan for Ecosystem Management	High	Section 3.2.2	All
Soil Resources Management Plan	High	Section 4.2.2.1	1, 2
Soils and Water Quality Management Plan	High	Section 4.2.2.2	All
Soil and Water Quality Monitoring	High	Section 4.2.3.1	1, 2
Planning-Level Soil Surveys	High	Section 4.2.3.2	1, 2
Planning-Level Floristic Inventories	High	Section 4.2.3.3	1, 2
Planning-Level Vegetation Surveys	High	Section 4.2.3.4	1, 2
Erosion Control and Streambank Stabilization	High	Section 4.2.4.2	1, 2
Wetland Management Plan	High	Section 5.1.2	All
Wetlands Monitoring	High	Section 5.1.3.1	All
Planning-Level Wetlands Surveys	High	Section 5.1.3.2	1, 2
Wetlands Management	High	Section 5.1.4	All
Forest Management Plan	High	Section 5.2.2	1, 2
Fire Management Plan	High	Section 5.3.2	1, 2
Fire Management	High	Section 5.3.4	1, 2
Habitat Management Plan	High	Section 5.4.2	1, 2
Fish and Wildlife Monitoring	High	Section 5.4.3.1	1, 2
Planning-Level Fauna Surveys	High	Section 5.4.3.2	1, 2
Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Species Management	High	Section 5.5.4	All
Special Interest Areas Management Plan	High	Section 5.6.2	1, 2
Installation Pest Management Plan	High	Section 5.7.2	1, 2
Outdoor Recreation Management Plan	High	Section 6.2.2	1, 2, 5
Conservation Enforcement	High	Section 6.3.4	1, 2
Geographic Information Systems	High	Section 7.2.4.1	All
Natural Resources Program Management	High	Section 8.2.2	All
Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan	High	Section 8.2.3	All
Training Requirements Integration	Medium	Section 4.1.2	All
Land Condition Trend Analysis	Medium	Section 4.1.3	1, 2
Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance	Medium	Section 4.1.4.1	1, 2
Environmental Awareness	Medium	Section 4.1.4.2	All
Habitat Management	Medium	Section 5.4.4.2	1, 2
Manage Soil and Water Quality	Low	Section 4.2.4.1	1,2
Forest Inventory	Low	Section 5.2.3	1, 2
Forest Management	Low	Section 5.2.4	1, 2
Fire and Fuels Inventory	Low	Section 5.3.3	1,2
Fish and Wildlife Management	Low	Section 5.4.4.1	1, 2
Manage Special Interest Areas	Low	Section 5.6.4	1, 2
Manage Urban Areas	Low	Section 5.8.4	1
Natural and Cultural Resources Education and Awareness	Low	Section 6.1.4	All
Monitor Recreational Use	Low	Section 6.2.3	1, 2
Manage Recreational Use	Low	Section 6.2.4	1, 2

* 1 = North Post 2 = South Post 3 = Haines 4 = Tok 5 = Seward Recreation Camp 6 = Eklutna Glacier 7 = Gakona

8.6.2 Funding

Until the latter part of the 1980s, natural resources funding was primarily Operations and Maintenance (O&M) dollars within DPW. As environmental funds (internally "fenced" O&M) increased and regular O&M funding decreased, natural resources projects came to rely more heavily upon other sources. Below are general discussions about different sources of funding to implement this INRMP.

8.6.2.1 Forestry Funds

Forestry funds are generated from sale of forest products on military lands and are centrally controlled by the Department of the Army. USARAK may be reimbursed for all costs associated with the maintenance and disposition of forest products. Forestry funds must be used only for projects directly related to forest ecosystem management. Such projects include timber management, reforestation, timber stand improvement, inventories, fire protection, construction and maintenance of timber area access roads, purchase of forestry equipment, disease and insect control, planning (including compliance with laws), marking, inspections, sales preparations, personnel training, and sales. DA Regulation AR 200-3 (Chapter 5) outlines collection and expenditures systems.

Proceeds from forest product sales that exceed reimbursable expenses will be split 60:40 between the local government and the DOD Forestry Reserve Account. Forestry Reserve Account funding requested by USARAK during 2002-2006 is shown in Table 8-5. The Forestry Reserve Account, administered by the Secretary of Defense, may be used for the following:

- Improvements of forest lands.
- Unanticipated contingencies in the administration of forest lands and the production of forest products for which other sources of funds are not available in a timely manner.
- Natural resources management that implements approved plans and agreements; the State of Alaska may use its portion of proceeds for the benefit of public schools and public roads.

Forestry funds are generated from the sale of timber on lands where the military controls vegetation management. The sale of timber on withdrawn PL106-65 lands is managed by the BLM, with sales receipts deposited in the U.S. Treasury. USARAK will generate a very small amount of forestry funds from Main Post and Gerstle River in 2002-2006 through its firewood, Christmas tree, and salvage sales program.

8.6.2.2 Agricultural Outlease Funding

Military land will be routinely examined to determine what areas, if any, can be made available for outleases. In accordance with the concept of multiple land use, areas which are required to support the military mission may also be outleased for agricultural purposes. Leasing of land for uses which are compatible with mission requirements can reduce installation maintenance efforts, provide opportunities for accomplishing land maintenance by the lessee at no cost to the installation, provide funds which the Army can use to support leasing efforts and other natural resources requirements, and support community relations and local economy.

All revenues from agriculture and grazing outleases will be deposited to the Army account established for that purpose and will be available through es-

Table 8-5. Forestry Reserve Account Funding Requirements 2002-2006.

Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
5.2.2 Forest Management Plan			$45,000		
5.2.3 Forest Inventory	$25,000	$30,000	$30,000	$35,000	$35,000
5.2.4 Forest Management	$55,000	$60,000	$60,000	$65,000	$65,000
TOTAL	**$80,000**	**$90,000**	**$135,000**	**$100,000**	**$100,000**

Table 8-6. Agricultural Outlease Account Funding Requirements 2002-2006.

Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
4.2.4.1 Manage Soil and Water Quality	$55,000	$60,000	$65,000	$65,000	$70,000
TOTAL	**$55,000**	**$60,000**	**$60,000**	**$65,000**	**$70,000**

tablished budget procedures (Section 2667, Title 10, United States Code (10 USC 2667), *Outleasing for Grazing and Agriculture on Military Lands*) for:

- Administrative and operational expenses of agricultural leases.
- Initiation, improvement, and perpetuation of agricultural leases.
- Preparation, revisions, and requirements of Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans.
- Implementation of Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans.

Requirements for funds derived from lease proceeds are identified annually in the EPR. Agricultural outlease funding requirements are identified in Table 8-6.

8.6.2.3 Fish and Wildlife Funds

DOD fish and wildlife funds are collected through sales of permits for hunting, trapping or fishing on military controlled lands. They are authorized by the Sikes Act and regulated via AR 200-3 (Chapter 6). These funds may be used only for fish and wildlife management on the installation where they are collected. They cannot be used for recreational activities. They are exempt from equipment purchase amount limitations, and they do not expire (unobligated funds carry over on 1 October).

USARAK has not used this source of funding. This option will be evaluated during 2002-2006.

8.6.2.4 Environmental Funding

Environmental funds are a special category of O&M's budget. The EPR process governs them. They are special in that they are fenced by DOD, but they are still subject to restrictions of O&M funds.

"Must fund" classifications include mitigation identified within Findings of No Significant Impact (FNSI), items required within Federal Facilities Compliance Agreements, and planning-level surveys. This INRMP is a Federal Facilities Requirement Agreement that contains projects and programs to mitigate various military activities.

Table 8-7 shows the environmental program requirements (including ITAM, other O&M, and Fort Wainwright projects that cover both installations) needed to implement this INRMP.

Thus, the total environmental fund budget for this INRMP is estimated at $10,185,000 for 2002-2006. These estimates will be adjusted each year as needed.

8.6.2.5 Training Funds

In FY 95, proponency for the ITAM program was transferred from Environmental to Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations and Plans (ODCSOPS), the military training side of the Army. Training funds set aside for ITAM are not internally fenced, as are environmental funds.

Fort Richardson and the other two Alaska Army posts are classified as a Category I installation. Category I installations are estimated to have average annual ITAM costs of $1,036,000 with the understanding that special circumstances may dictate changes in these numbers (which must be justified). Instructions for the ITAM budget submittal (ODCSOPS 1995a) state that ITAM funding requests will not contain projects that fall within Conservation Compliance. The total ITAM budget for this INRMP is estimated at $2,099,500 for 2002-2006 (Table 8-8). These estimates will be adjusted, as needed, each year.

Table 8-7. Environmental Program Requirements.

EPR Number	Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
FRA020008	3.2.1 Ecosystem Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$40,000	$0
FRA020009	3.2.2 Aerial Monitoring Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$40,000	$0
FRA9700001	4.2.2.1 Soil Resources Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$50,000	$0
FRA0200010	4.2.2.2 Soil and Water Quality Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$40,000	$0
FRA0200034	4.2.3.1 Monitor Soil and Water Quality	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000
FRA9500026	4.2.3.2 Planning-Level Soil Surveys	$0	$0	$250,000	$0	$0
FRA9800003	4.2.3.3 Planning-Level Floristic Inventories	$0	$0	$0	$0	$100,000
FRA9800002	4.2.3.4 Planning-Level Vegetation Surveys	$0	$0	$0	$0	$200,000
FRA0200035	4.2.4.1 Manage Soil and Water Quality	Funding identified under agricultural outleasing section.				
FRA9700002	4.2.4.2 Erosion Control and Streambank Stabilization	$210,000	$210,000	$215,000	$215,000	$220,000
FRA9700009	5.1.2 Wetland Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$40,000	$0
FRA0200015	5.1.3.1 Wetlands Monitoring	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000
FRA9100035	5.1.3.2 Planning-Level Wetlands Surveys	$0	$0	$0	$0	$130,000
FRA9800004	5.1.4 Wetlands Management	$40,000	$40,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000
FRA9700005	5.2.2 Forest Management Plan	Funding identified under forestry section.				
FRA9800007	5.2.3 Forest Inventory					
FRA9800008	5.2.4 Forest Management					
FRA9700008	5.3.2 Fire Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$60,000	$0
FRA0200016	5.3.3 Fire Inventory	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000
FRA0200017	5.3.4 Fire Management	$55,000	$55,000	$55,000	$55,000	$55,000
FRA9700015	5.4.2 Habitat Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$40,000	$0
FRA9700016	5.4.3.1 Fish and Wildlife Monitoring	$45,000	$45,000	$50,000	$50,000	$55,000
FRA9700011	5.4.3.2 Planning-Level Fauna Surveys	$0	$0	$0	$0	$200,000
FRA9800005	5.4.4.1 Fish and Wildlife Management	$35,000	$335,000	$340,000	$340,000	$345,000
FRA910010	5.4.4.2 Habitat Management	$60,000	$60,000	$65,000	$65,000	$70,000
FRA0200013	5.5.4 Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Species Management	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000
FRA9700007	5.6.2 Special Interest Areas Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$40,000	$0
FRA0200018	5.6.4 Manage Special Interest Areas	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000
FRA9900005	5.7.2 Installation Pest Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$50,000

Table 8-7, continued

EPR Number	Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
FRA9500006	5.8.4 Urban Area Management	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000
FRA9600001	6.1.4 Natural and Cultural Resources Education and Awareness	$35,000	$35,000	$40,000	$40,000	$45,000
FRA9500005	6.2.2 Outdoor Recreation Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$45,000	$0
FRA9600007	6.2.3 Monitor Recreational Use	$40,000	$40,000	$45,000	$45,000	$50,000
FRA9500007	6.2.4 Manage Recreational Use	$35,000	$35,000	$40,000	$40,000	$45,000
FRA9800006	6.3.4 Conservation Enforcement	$205,000	$210,000	$210,000	$215,000	$215,000
FRA040004	7.2.4.1 Geographic Information Systems	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000
FRA9200016	8.2.2 Program Management	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000
FRA910019	8.2.3 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000	$300,000
	TOTAL	**$1,450,000**	**$1,755,000**	**$2,045,000**	**$2,195,000**	**$2,740,000**

Table 8-8. ITAM Funding Requirements during 2002-2006.

Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
4.1.4.1 Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance	$522,000	$423,000	$320,000	$219,000	$406,000
4.1.4.2 Environmental Awareness	$1,000	$3,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
4.1.2 Training Requirements Integration	$183,750	$185,000	$186,250	$187,500	$188,750
4.1.3 Land Condition Trend Analysis	$135,000	$140,000	$145,000	$150,000	$155,000
TOTAL	**$841,750**	**$751,000**	**$652,250**	**$557,500**	**$750,750**

8.6.2.6 Other Funding

The Legacy Program remains an additional source of funding. However, funding for the Legacy Program has been greatly reduced over past levels. The only types of Legacy projects available for funding are large projects, regional in scope, involving many other agencies as partners. While USARAK will continue to seek legacy funding, it is not expected to be a viable source for implementing this INRMP. The law authorizing the program is still in effect and this allows the DOD to enter into cooperative agreements to conduct projects that "implement the purposes of the Legacy Resources Management Program" (see P.L. 101-511 (FY 91 Appropriations Act, Sec. 8120)), whether or not separately earmarked Legacy money is available. USARAK intends to use such cooperative agreements during 2002-2006.

8.6.3 INRMP Implementation Costs

Specific costs for each program and project are difficult to predict, especially considering that future events affect many programs. The average annual costs below are estimated by types of funding:

Forestry: $101,000
Agricultural Outleasing: $62,000
Fish and Wildlife: $0 unless a permit system is installed.

Environmental: $2,037,000 for projects that qualify for environmental funding.
Training: $710,650 for ITAM.

Average annual funding to implement this INRMP will be $2,910,650. The five-year cost of implementing this INRMP will likely be approximately $14,553,250.

The above costs do not include related organizations such as PMO and Outdoor Recreation, nor do they include costs incurred by other agencies such as ADFG and BLM. Some funds above, however, are planned to be used to support these programs run by other organizations and agencies. It is also noted that it is often difficult to determine which costs are natural resources and which are environmental, since the two programs are so closely related at Fort Richardson. Pest management costs are not included.

8.7 Command Support

Command support is essential to implement this INRMP. Without this support, priority projects for natural resources management will not occur. Failure to execute these projects risks violation of environmental laws, reduced mission readiness, and negative public reaction to a lack of environmental stewardship. The installation commander is responsible for compliance with environmental laws and sets the tone for environmental stewardship. Command emphasis on this INRMP ensures a healthy environment, sustainable resources, and quality future training lands.